

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICA NEEDS THE MARITIME SECURITY ACT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago our world was entrenched in a brutal world war that transformed many facets of the global arena. We would not have won World War II if it were not for the strength of the U.S. merchant marine. If our Nation is to continue being a world leader, we must strengthen our merchant marine fleet. Once the largest in the world, the 5,000-ship fleet has been diminished to a mere 375 ships. We as a nation cannot afford to lose anymore ground to the countries who are taking over the world's oceans.

Many people ask where a threat is coming from that justifies the cost of strengthening the U.S. merchant marine. I would answer that question with a question. Think back to the night of November 9, 1989, just 6 years ago, when we all rejoiced to see the Berlin Wall being breached and the many Berliners who were dancing at the Brandenburg Gate.

On that night when we celebrated the lifting of the Iron Curtain in Europe and the downfall of the former Soviet Empire, who could have imagined that only 14 months later more than 1 million troops would be poised for battle in the Persian Gulf? Who could have imagined that the United States and its allies would shortly have to begin the largest logistical movement of troops and material since World War II?

My point is simply this: The world remains an extraordinarily dangerous and unpredictable place. There is room for legitimate argument about what the specific priorities in the defense budget should be. But there can be little doubt that we are rapidly reaching the point where America's defense maritime capabilities will be in real jeopardy. This is a risk our country cannot afford to take and we should do anything in our power to see to it that America never repeats the mistakes of the past, the mistakes that produced a hollow military as recently as the late 1970's.

A strong U.S. flag ship fleet will also lead to many economic benefits for our Nation. The creation of over 100,000 at sea and ashore would bring in over \$4.5 billion in household earnings. With major seaports on three coasts, there is no reason why there should not be hundreds of ships being built. At the present time there are only two ships being built in U.S. ports. This production level puts the United States behind Brazil, Croatia, and even Romania in shipbuilding. We cannot afford to lose the technological shipbuilding capabilities that we have at our disposal in America.

If something is not done today to strengthen our merchant marine fleet, the size of the fleet could drop to 100 ships. We are already 16th in the world in fleet size and we simply cannot drop any further. No world power has ever

survived without a merchant fleet and we cannot afford to lose more ground in the global competition.

That is why Congress is now taking steps to fortify our Nation's merchant marine. House Resolution 1350—the Maritime Security Act—which I wholeheartedly support and have sponsored, will stabilize our national security fleet. This bill proposes that \$2 million be set aside each year for 10 years in order to increase the amount of merchant vessels in the U.S. fleet. This same bill passed the House last year, but stalled in the Senate. This year, however, Senator TRENT LOTT has spearheaded the drive to get this bill through the Senate and he believes that this year will be different.

Aside from creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and enhancing our economic base in the maritime industry, the Maritime Security Act will ensure security overseas for all American citizens who depend on the merchant marines. During the Persian Gulf war over 20 percent of goods, ammunition, and supplies were transported on foreign subsidized flag ships. Some of these ships refused to enter into enemy waters to deliver vital goods to our soldiers. This fact is frightening. If we do not strengthen our merchant marine fleet, we will be putting our men and women in the Armed Forces in tremendous danger.

The United States must have a strong fleet of American ships with American trained crews to supply our troops in the event of an emergency or war. During World War II, our own merchant fleet with its American crews sacrificed their lives to provide their comrades in foreign lands with needed supplies. We need to have that security in today's world also, for there are thousands of men and women in the Armed Forces overseas who must not be neglected.

The United States has many global interests that must be preserved. In order to maintain these interests and further America's lead in the global sphere, we must have access to foreign markets through the oceans. The Maritime Security Act will be the first step toward accomplishing that goal by strengthening America's merchant marine fleet. I urge support for this vital legislation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 21, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

In a nationally televised speech President Clinton recently joined congressional leaders in calling for an historic reduction in the federal budget deficit and for a reduction in

the size of government. He stepped from the sidelines on the budget debate and laid out a ten-year route to a balanced budget which dramatically scales back much of what government does. He wants to balance the budget by the year 2005 while still investing in education and training, taking serious steps toward health care reform while protecting its beneficiaries, and targeting modest tax cuts to working families. He calls for real cuts in most areas of government spending other than Social Security.

DIFFERENCES

Although the President and congressional leadership agree on the broad outlines of balancing the budget, many differences remain. President Clinton would balance the budget over ten years; their plan says seven. He would cut taxes only for the middle class; the House leadership would also cut taxes for upper-income taxpayers. And their tax cuts would be much more costly—\$350 billion versus the \$96 billion the President proposes. The President eliminates \$25 billion in corporate subsidies; they would not. He trims spending for the poor while they cut it sharply. He squeezes Medicare and Medicaid; they cut back these programs much more. Both he and the congressional leadership reach a balanced budget by making fairly optimistic economic projections, such as assuming that interest rates will fall sharply.

The President increases spending on education, training, and medical and scientific research, areas the congressional leadership would cut. On health care the President offers a plan far less ambitious than his original health care reform proposal of a year ago. But he does propose to save \$124 billion from Medicare and \$55 billion from Medicaid; the congressional leadership's cutbacks would be more than twice as much. He reaches the Medicare savings by reducing growth in health care costs, not by asking beneficiaries to pay more.

NEW STRATEGY

The President has clearly chosen the path of conciliation as a better way for him than continued confrontation with the congressional leadership. He dropped his stand-pat budget which he submitted to Congress in February and joins the chorus to eliminate the deficit. The President has received sharp criticism from some members of his own party as well as some indications of openness from the congressional leadership. He is positioning himself as an independent, centrist leader. He has rightly rejected the strategy of just counterpunching against congressional budget proposals and has indicated that he believes a President's responsibilities rise above politics to leadership.

GROWING CONSENSUS

There isn't any doubt that Congress and the President are now very serious about bringing the budget into balance. That means the question is not whether to balance the budget into balance. That means the question is not whether to balance the budget but when and how. This is good news. The federal budget has been in the red every year but one, 1969, since the Eisenhower Administration. Public opinion polls which show 80% of the American people favoring a balanced budget have had a strong impact. But quite apart from politics, the economic arguments for a balanced budget are also

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

very strong. Consistently large budget deficits endanger the country's economic future and cheat future generations of Americans. Balancing the budget will increase national savings and that means greater national investment in physical, human, and technological capital. That in turn will increase productivity and boost incomes for Americans.

Many Americans believe that balancing the budget is not just an economic issue but almost a moral issue—that the government's inability to balance the budget means the country has lost a moral sense of fiscal responsibility. They see the huge deficits as shifting the burden to the next generation. Others look at deficits as shifting the burden to the next generation. Others look at deficits in more practical terms. They see no great harm with a deficit in any one year, but believe the continuing deficits undermine the economic underpinnings of the country. So a growing consensus has come to the view that deficit spending must end.

The details of balancing the budget still remain. In the current political climate neither Social Security nor defense spending can be cut and taxes cannot be raised. That puts enormous pressure on a rather small part of the government's total budget composed of Medicare, Medicaid, and other social welfare programs. Rather than gutting important programs such as health care for older Americans, our emphasis needs to be on reforms to make government work better and cost less.

ASSESSMENT

I think the President's new position on the budget is much better than his old one. He now wants to continue the deficit reduction that he started in the first two years of his administration, but he wants to do it more gently than others have proposed. Cutting the deficit too hard too fast could lead to a lot of pain which could undermine political support for a balanced budget. The President believes that a more gradual approach increases the chances of getting to a balanced budget.

I believe that both the congressional leadership and the President are wrong in providing for tax cuts now. The President's tax cut is much smaller and more targeted than the congressional leadership's. By the stretchout in years and the smaller tax cut he gets to his goal of a balanced budget without cutting as much from important programs like Medicare. But I believe any tax cut at this time is a bad idea. It does not make sense to me to borrow more money to provide a tax cut now. It is better to cut the spending, get the budget into balance, and then give ourselves a tax cut. We simply make the problem much more difficult if we add to the deficit we want to reduce.

Although I disagree with some of its specifics, I think the President has put forth a sensible plan for budgetary discipline. I am pleased to see that both parties are now on the same course. At the same time, no one should think the battle has been won. Much of the budget debate from this point on will be seen more as a skirmish over details, but some major decisions still lie ahead.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. ENOCH H. WILLIAMS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with pleasure to pay tribute to an extraordinary

public servant from Brooklyn, NY—Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Williams. General Williams retired as Commander of the New York Army National Guard on May 31, 1995, after over 30 years of active military service.

Major General Williams earned his commission in 1950 after serving as an enlisted member during World War II. Rising from the rank of second lieutenant to colonel, he served in many positions, among them—artillery officer, transportation officer, liaison to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, and Commander of Selective Service, and Headquarters Detachment. General Williams was appointed Commander of the New York Army National Guard in 1990. His military education includes Field Artillery School, the Air Defense School Command and General Staff College, and the Industrial War College. Military decorations General Williams has earned include the Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Medal, and both the Bronze and Silver Selective Service System Meritorious Service Medals.

General Williams received a B.S. in business management from Long Island University. He also attended New York University and the New School for Social Research.

In his civilian occupation, General Williams is serving his fifth term as a New York City councilman, representing the 41st Councilmanic District. The 41st district covers the multiethnic Brooklyn communities of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brownsville, East Flatbush, and Crown Heights. General Williams also gives freely of his time to serve in many governmental positions. He is a member of the American Institute of Housing Consultants, Community Service Society, and the New York Urban League. He is currently civilian director of the New York City Selective Service System. General Williams' dedicated service to the U.S. military merits special recognition. I take great pleasure and pride in entering these words of commendation into the RECORD.

IN TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. CHARLES DOMINY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to recognize the service of Lt. Gen. Charles E. Dominy to the U.S. Army and to our Nation as he prepares to retire.

General Dominy's career in the Army has spanned 33 years, including his service as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy. During these three decades he has served our Nation in a number of important capacities. In his final assignment prior to retirement, General Dominy serves as chief of the Army legislative liaison and as director of the U.S. Army staff, a position from which he has had to confront the numerous issues and developments surrounding the Armed Forces in the 1990's. His work has received widespread praise and commendation.

As chief of the Army's Office of Legislative Liaison, he worked with Members of Congress and their staffs on the numerous issues affecting our Nation's military. Before his tenure in Washington, General Dominy was a platoon leader as well as a leader and trainer for Army troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Lt. Gen. Charles Dominy for all of his dedicated service and hard work, and I am honored to join with his family, friends, and colleagues in recognizing his accomplishments and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

EDSAT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA and I will be reintroducing legislation designed to facilitate the development of an integrated, nationwide telecommunications system dedicated to education. This bill would guarantee the acquisition of a satellite system to be used solely for communications among State and local instructional resource providers.

Certainly every student in America deserves equal access to quality education. Unfortunately, not every small rural or poor inner-city school can afford to hire specialized instructors to provide the education for children the way that schools in larger and wealthier communities can.

One way to bridge this gap is through the use of satellite technology for distance learning. With the efficient use of an integrated, satellite-based communications system linked by cable and telephone lines, distance learning can provide children access to vast educational resources, regardless of wealth or geographic location.

I have long been interested in helping to strengthen and improve the utilization of telecommunications in the U.S. economy and educational institutions. The need for a satellite dedicated solely to education programming has been apparent since the issue was raised at the 1989 education summit. Since that time, the nonprofit National Education Telecommunications Organization [NETO], along with its wholly owned subsidiary, the Education Satellite Corporation [EDSAT], has been working to improve the availability of educational programming for schools, universities, and libraries across the country.

The EDSAT Institute found that while the education sector is expanding and investing heavily in telecommunications systems, they are often not able to commit to expensive long-term contracts with satellite providers. This puts them at a competitive disadvantage with other buyers of satellite time. In addition, as occasional users, the education sector is forced to pay high and variable prices for undependable services.

Finally, the current system is set up so that educational programs are often spread out among 12 to 15 satellites. Every time the user wants to switch to a different program, they have to adjust their satellite dish. NETO's goal is to create the infrastructure necessary to establish an integrated telecommunications system at affordable costs to the education sector.

Dedicating a satellite for education and collocating programming that is now scattered across numerous satellites will allow schools to receive far more educational programming—without constantly reorienting their satellite dishes. Collocation will also enhance the